# SUPREME COURT MINUTES TUESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2006 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S126233 C038245 Third Appellate District PEOPLE v. WARNER

Finality of the opinion in the above-entitled case is hereby extended to and including October 10, 2006.

S132619 B159255 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 REGENCY OUTDOOR ADVERTISING v. CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Time extended to consider modification or rehearing to November 3, 2006.

#### S057321

#### PEOPLE v. LOMAX (DARREL L.)

Extension of time granted to October 24, 2006, to file the appellant's reply brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 60 additional days are contemplated. Extension is granted based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Jessica K. Maguire's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by December 26, 2006.

#### S065720

#### PEOPLE v. VINES (SEAN VENYETTE)

Extension of time granted to October 27, 2006, to file appellant's reply brief. Extension is granted based upon counsel Gilbert Gaynor's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by October 27, 2006. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

#### S068863

### PEOPLE v. SCOTT (DAVID LYNN)

Extension of time granted to November 6, 2006, to file the respondent's brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 90 additional days are contemplated. Extension is granted based upon Deputy Attorney General Adrianne S. Denault's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by February 6, 2007.

#### S070250

#### PEOPLE v. JOHNSON (MICHAEL)

Extension of time granted to October 24, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 200 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Anthony J. Dain's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by mid-May 2007.

# S070536

# PEOPLE v. MACIEL (LUIS)

Extension of time granted to October 23, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 100 additional days are contemplated. Extension is granted based upon counsel Melissa Hill's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by the end of January 2007.

# S074624

# PEOPLE v. MARTINEZ (TOMMY JESSE)

Extension of time granted to October 31, 2006, to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 60 additional days is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon counsel Christopher Johns's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by December 31, 2006.

#### S077166

# PEOPLE v. MCKINNON (CRANDELL)

Extension of time granted to October 2, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender C. Delaine Renard's representation that she anticipates filing that brief by October 2, 2006. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

# S091915

#### PEOPLE v. NUNEZ & SATELE

Extension of time granted to October 27, 2006, to file appellant Saatele's opening brief.

#### S093803

# PEOPLE v. SEUMANU (ROPATI)

Extension of time granted to October 27, 2006, to file appellant's opening brief.

#### S145330

# 962 SUSPENSION

Having been provided proof of compliance pursuant to Family Code 17520, the suspension of **MICHAEL R. McCABE**, **State Bar No. 137844**, pursuant to our order filed on July 26, 2006, is hereby terminated. This order is final forthwith.

#### S145330

#### 962 SUSPENSION

Having been provided proof of compliance pursuant to Family Code 17520, the suspension of **STEVEN J. RENSHAW**, **State Bar No. 132640**, pursuant to our order filed on July 26, 2006, is hereby terminated. This order is final forthwith.

# S144526

# MARKUM ON DISCIPLINE

It is ordered that **JAMES BRIAN MARKUM, State Bar No. 170326,** be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation, including restitution, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed on May 9, 2006. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is ordered that costs be awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code § 6086.10, and one-third of said costs be paid with membership fees for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009. It is further ordered that if respondent fails to pay any installment within the time provided herein or as may be modified by the State Bar Court pursuant to section 6086.10, subdivision (c), the remaining balance of the costs is due and enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code § 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

# S144527

# MANN ON DISCIPLINE

It is ordered that **JEFF A. MANN, State Bar No. 115932,** be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he provides proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in

its Order Approving Stipulation filed on May 11, 2006. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code § 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code § 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

#### S144529

### PRICE ON DISCIPLINE

It is hereby ordered that **ROGER DANIEL PRICE, State Bar No. 106203,** be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. Respondent is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code § 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code § 6140.7 and as a money judgment.

\*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

**BAR MISC. 4186** 

IN THE MATTER OF THE APLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE OF BAR EXAMINERS OF THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA FOR ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS

The written motion of the Committee of Bar Examiners that the following named applicants, who have fulfilled the requirements for admission to practice law in the State of California, be admitted to the practice of law in this state is hereby granted, with permission to the applicants to take the oath before a competent officer at another time and place:

(SEE ATTACHED LIST OF NAMES TO ORIGINAL ORDER)

### B185051

### PEOPLE V. YAGLE

The time for granting review on the court's own motion is hereby extended to and including October 11, 2006. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 28.2(c).)